

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated August 27, 2008, Claims 1, 16, 19, 21-23, 26, 28, 29, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,127,532 issued to Cimino et al. (hereinafter "the Cimino patent"). Claims 5, 6, 18, 30, 31, 33, and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cimino in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,557 issued to Palaniappan (hereinafter "the Palaniappan patent"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 7-13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cimino and Titus in view of the Palaniappan patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cimino in view of Almblad et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicant had a teleconference with Examiner Becker on November 13, 2008, to discuss the outstanding rejection. In that discussion, Applicant and Examiner Becker discussed the background of the invention, the status of the pending claims, and the references used to currently rejecting the claims. And while Applicant believes that the pending claims are literally distinguishable over the Cimino reference, Examiner Becker was gracious in suggesting that only clarification to the existing claim language may be necessary to overcome the outstanding rejections.

As such, Applicant developed clarifying amendments to both independent claims as discussed with Examiner Becker on November 13 and submitted those for brief discussion with Examiner Becker. Applicant appreciates Examiner Becker's helpfulness in discussing the claim language and assisting in crafting much of the language used to clarify claims 1 and 19 in view of the known prior art, particularly the Cimino reference. Therefore, based upon the several discussions with Examiner Becker, enclosed are amendments to independent claims 1 and 19


clarifying that the graphical user interface has a plurality of input fields for the input of a specified variable, where at least one input field requests the input of the intended use of an object as the specified variable.

Conclusion

In view of the discussions with Examiner Becker regarding the prior art references as well as the discussions regarding the present amendments to claims 1 and 19, Applicants submit these amendments together with a Request for Continued Examination. In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, and accordingly, respectfully request the allowance thereof. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this case, the Examiner is encouraged to call undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 25, 2008



Robert H. Earp, III, Reg. No. 41,004
McDonald Hopkins LLC
600 Superior Avenue, E.
Suite 2100
Cleveland, OH 44114-2653
(216) 430-2003